

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks and the application has been amended in light thereof. Claims 25-52 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 25, 27, 32, 33, 35-38, 42, 44-47 and 51-52 have been amended by this Amendment B. Reconsideration of the application claims as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. The following remarks will follow the sequence of the Office action.

Claims 25, 26, 32, 35-37 and 40-42 stand rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22, 1-3 and 10-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,162. Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's rejection on the basis of obviousness-type double patenting and reserve the right to traverse the rejection. However, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, filed simultaneously with this Amendment B is a **Terminal Disclaimer** overcoming this rejection.

The title has been amended to be more descriptive and corresponds to the preamble of the claims.

The typographical error in claim 25 has been corrected.

Submitted with this Amendment B is Replacement Sheet 1/4 Figure 1 has been amended to include reference character 32 and to indicate that reference character 54 refers to the user ID password.

Claims 25, 33, 35, 36, 38, 42, 47 and 52 have been amended along with several other claims to delete the words "likely" and "potentially" so that the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112 may be withdrawn. Claims 38, 44 and 45 have also been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the terms therein. Thus,

the rejection of the claims based on 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duffy (U.S. Patent 5,911,043). The Examiner points to col. 3, lines 58-67 of Duffy with regard to the relative weighting and indicates that "the more offensive the word or phrases, the higher the value." It is noted that it is not clear from Duffy whether actual ratings and weightings are occurring with regard to the email since Duffy refers to a rating rules database which is not illustrated. Thus, it is not clear to the undersigned as to how Duffy presents a database including a relative weighting associated with each regular expression as recited by claim 25.

Further, claim 25 has been amended to recite that the method includes incrementally adjusting the weighting associated with each regular expression in the database based on error data accumulated from analyzing content of training data. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph 38 of the re-typed specification, referring to Figure 2. It is noted that the Duffy reference, as well as the other art cited, fails to teach incrementally adjusting the weighting. In fact, Duffy does not address the question of adjusting the weighting and does not particularly specify that any of the weighting would in any way be incrementally adjusted. Further, Duffy does not explicitly address the aspect of weighting in the context of claim 25 and the invention.

Thus, it is submitted that claim 25 and claims 26 and 27 depending from claim 25 are patentable over Duffy so that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn.

Further, with regard to claim 27, the Examiner points to col. 9, lines 4-5 wherein Duffy indicates that access to a document may be denied. It is not seen how this provides an

indication of a reason that the downloaded email was prevented from display according to claim 27. Thus, applicants submit that claim 27 is distinguishable over Duffy for this reason as well.

Claims 28 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rose (U.S. 5,724,567). The Examiner cites col. 2, lines 22-25 and col. 4, lines 9-14 of Rose which mention an unstructured global database and a message database 20 having an index 24 for the stored messages, for example, its title. According to lines 11-13 of col. 4, "the index can contain other information pertinent to the stored messages as well." The Examiner further cites col. 2, lines 31-36 as relating to an inquiry component. The Examiner characterizes this as a "user request item." However, applicants submit that the Examiner is employing hindsight analysis to interpret the Rose patent in this regard. In particular, this section of Rose states nothing more than "when a user accesses the system, the system delivers to that user an identification of those items of information in the global database which are believed to be important to the user. The system may also notify the user when new relevant items become available." There is nothing in this section of the Rose patent which specifies an inquiry component for selecting and presenting meta-content from the internal database in response to an end-user request. Thus, applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 28 and 30-31 based on Rose as it is submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn. In summary, it is not seen that Rose discloses a data acquisition component which acquires meta-content and further an inquiry component for selecting and presenting meta-content from the internal database in response to an end-user request.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose in view of Duffy and Nielsen (U.S. Patent 6,453,327). Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and is patentable over Rose for the same reasons as noted above with regard to claim 28. The Examiner cites Nielsen as disclosing junk email and Duffy as disclosing calculating ratings. In contrast, it is noted that claim 29 recites fourth means for calculating including means for determining and taking into account a total number of natural language words that appear in the identified natural language textual portions of the email. In contrast, the references cited and particularly Duffy teach away from this aspect of the invention by disclosing that each rule in the rating rules database 22 may specify a word or phrase and a rule rating indicating if and to what degree a word or phrase is inappropriate, objectionable, or offensive for a particular age group, geographical location, demographical grouping, or other consideration. Thus, the system of Duffy does not take into account the total number of natural language words that appear in the identified natural language textual portions of the email. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 29 is patentable and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 32-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duffy in view of Nielsen. Independent claims 32 and 37 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendment to claim 25 in order to specify incrementally adjusting the weighting. As noted above, Duffy is deficient in this regard. Similarly, Nielsen does not address incrementally adjusting the weighting. Instead, teaches a classification system for junk email. Thus, the rejection of claims 32 and 37 should be withdrawn. Claims 33-36 and 38-46 depend from claims 32 and 37 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Claims 47-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duffy in view of Nielsen. Once again, claim 47 has been amended to recite incrementally adjusting the weighting, an amendment which is similar to the amendments which have been made to claims 25, 32 and 37. Thus, claim 47 is patentable the combination of Duffy and Nielsen for the reasons noted above. Claims 48-52 are patentable for the reasons noted above and based on their dependency from claim 47.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels, for any reason, that a personal interview will expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Applicants do not believe that a fee is due in connection with this response. If, however, the Commissioner determines that a fee is due, he is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/caa